discussions and ethical controversies over blood transfusions: Who receives blood transfusions? What are the indications? We also faced ethical dilemmas over genetic therapy.

Well, the 21st century, the current century, brings even more profound ethical questions, and they are going to come with increasing frequency. How we and humanity handle our gathering control over these mysteries of cell development and embryo development will reflect who we are as a people and where we are going.

Today, the Senate will begin debate on these three important pieces of legislation: the Alternative Pluripotent Stem Cell Therapies Enhancement Act, from Senators SANTORUM and SPECTER; the Fetus Farming Prohibition Act of 2006, Senators SANTORUM and BROWNBACK; and the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act, the so-called—in the House—Castle-DeGette bill, and in the Senate, the Specter-Hatch bill.

Many of my colleagues have, like me, spent hours grappling with these issues: the future of stem cell research, how we balance pro-life positions with the potential for new life and health offered by stem cell research. There is, perhaps, an inclination to avoid such difficult issues, to ignore them and to let others debate, but I have come to realize we must participate in defining research surrounding the culture of life. If not, it will define us.

Five years ago, on July 18, 2001, I came to the Chamber and laid out a comprehensive proposal to promote stem cell research within an ethical framework. I proposed 10 specific interdependent principles. I also said that policymakers and the public must reassess on an ongoing basis the research and the circumstances under which it is conducted because science will continue to advance. As the 21st century progresses and as science—developmental biology—advances, we will continually face moral and ethical challenges. It is our responsibility, as individuals and as a body politic, to reassess the constructs governing biomedical research. It will define us. That is why I brought cord legislation to the floor earlier in the year, and it was passed.

As I said then and as I believe now, we must also do all we can to pursue other alternative strategies that will hold potential for developing pluripotent stem cell lines without damaging or destroying nascent human life. That is why, in the package before us today, I have asked the Senate to consider legislation to enhance support for alternatives to embryonic stem cell research. I am extremely pleased that Senator SANTORUM and Senator SPECTER worked together to craft the Alternative Pluripotent Stem Cell Therapies Enhancement Act. Their bill is similar to legislation I worked on with Senator ISAKSON and others of our colleagues last year, and I encourage every Senator to support it.

This bill would fund alternative methods of potentially deriving pluripotent stem cells, including extracting from embryos that are no longer living, nonlethal and nonharmful extraction from embryos; extraction from artificially created organisms that are not embryos but are embryo-like; and reprogramming adult cells to a pluripotent state through fusion with embryonic cell lines. There is no reason this legislation shouldn't gather the support of every Member of this body. It should unify us.

The second bill we will consider is the Fetus Farming Prohibition Act of 2006. Specifically, the bill prohibits the implantation and gestation of an embryo in a human or animal for the purpose of aborting for research—the manufacture of human life for experimental purposes. Senators BROWNBACK and SANTORUM have proposed legislation that would draw a clear line which should not be crossed. This is a forward-leaning pro-life bill, a moral guardrail in place before any inducement exists to promote it.

Shortly after I originally outlined my principles 5 years ago, President Bush announced his policy on embryonic stem cell research. It federally funded embryonic stem cell research for the first time. It did so within an ethical framework, and it showed respect for human life.

President Bush and I do not differ about the need for strong guidelines governing stem cell research. His policy was generally consistent with the principles I set forth a month before his announcement back in 2001. However, as science has progressed over the last 5 years, we have learned that fewer than the anticipated number of cell lines have proved suitable for research, and I think the limit on cell lines available for federally funded research is too restrictive.

H.R. 810, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act, addresses this restriction in our current policy. It has many shortcomings, but it is clearly consistent with my fifth principle on stem cell research: ''Provide funding for embryonic stem cell research only from blastocysts that would otherwise be discarded.'' In fact, the bill applies what I proposed in 2001 verbatim. It allows Federal funding for research using only those embryonic stem cells derived from blastocysts that are left over after in vitro fertilization and would otherwise be discarded.

Mr. President, in closing, all three of the bills the Senate will address beginning at 12:30 today will raise profound ethical questions that are challenging. They merit serious dialogue, and they merit serious debate. That is why I am pleased that on an issue of this magnitude, Senators will have the opportunity over the next 2 days to have their ideas considered and voted on separately and cleanly.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, am I correct that we are now in a period of morning business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ISRAEL

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I rise again today to discuss the situation in the Middle East where our Israeli allies are fighting unprovoked aggression by a terrorist army on their border. To date, over 1,000 rockets and missiles have been fired into Israel, killing more than a dozen civilians. It was especially disturbing to hear that the missile which collapsed a three-story building in Haifa earlier today was a Syrian model, loaded with ball bearings to cause maximum civilian casualties.

At a time when one of our closest allies is threatened by indiscriminate attacks on its population centers and our President and Secretary of State are overseas, it is incumbent on this body to remain united in standing behind Israel. I am pleased that the leadership is drafting a resolution expressing bipartisan condemnation of Hezbollah's attacks and in support of Israel's right to respond in the name of self-defense.

I am pleased that our allies, too, understand the grave nature of this crisis and its origins. The joint statement released over the weekend by the G8 states unequivocally that this violence:

> Results from efforts by extremist forces to destabilize the region and to frustrate the aspirations of the Palestinian, Israeli, and Lebanese people for democracy and peace. These extremist elements and those that support them cannot be allowed to plunge the Middle East into chaos, and a wider conflict.

Even some Arab governments, including Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Jordan, took the commendable step of chastising Hezbollah for its ''unexpected, inappropriate, and irresponsible acts.''

In light of the chaos being precipitated by Hezbollah's rocket and missile capability—a capability being provided directly to Hezbollah by the governments of Syria and Iran—I thought it would be appropriate to take a moment today to talk about how that threat can be addressed. The estimated 13,000 missiles currently in Hezbollah's arsenal are hidden throughout Southern Lebanon, in private homes, caves, and factories. At present, the only way to destroy these systems is to search them out on foot—a risky and potentially provocative solution. Alternatively, Israeli forces can strike at missile launchers after they have fired, meaning that at least one salvo will already be en route. It would be a vast improvement if Israel had the option of neutralizing the Hezbollah threat through defensive, rather than offensive means.

Israel currently has access to Patriot and Arrow missile defense technologies, great systems which are critical for defending against longer-range missiles, but poorly suited to defend Israeli territory from the types of rockets and missiles currently being fired by Hezbollah.

It is for this reason that I support the U.S. Missile Defense Agency efforts—in cooperation with the Israeli Missile Defense Organization—to develop a system for short-range missile defense. Aimed at projectiles with a range of less than 200 kilometers, this system would provide Israel with another way to defend itself, rather than having to rely exclusively on offensive action. It is propitious that the Defense Appropriations Committee is marking up its bill this week. For more than a year, I have worked with Senators STEVENS and INOUYE to support the short-range missile defense program. Under their leadership, I believe that the committee will provide the investment necessary to accelerate fielding of the system. Unfortunately, the need for a redoubled effort is now clearer than ever.

We still do not know how the current crisis is going to end. What we can and should say, however, is that Israel has the full support of this body in its ongoing efforts to fight terrorists, protect its citizens, and create the circumstances for peaceful coexistence with Lebanon, and all of its neighbors.

ORDER FOR STAR PRINT—H.R. 5672

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that H.R. 5672 be star printed.

The ACTING PRESIDING pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDING pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

FETUS FARMING PROHIBITION ACT OF 2006

ALTERNATIVE PLURIPOTENT STEM CELL THERAPIES ENHANCEMENT ACT

STEM CELL RESEARCH ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2005

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 having arrived, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of S. 3504, S. 2754, and H.R. 810, en bloc, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 810) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for human embryonic stem cell research.

A bill (S. 3504) to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit the solicitation or acceptance of tissue from fetuses gestated for research purposes, and for other purposes.

A bill (S. 2754) to derive human pluripotent stem cell lines using techniques that do not knowingly harm embryos.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may use this hourglass during the course of the debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, it is difficult to characterize the importance of the debate which the Senate is now beginning because the most fundamental aspect of human life is our health. Without our health, there is nothing we can do. Medical research has performed wonders, and stem cells, which came upon the scene in November of 1998, have the most remarkable potential of any scientific discovery ever made with respect to human health. These stem cells have the capacity to regenerate disease cells in the human body and have the capacity to cure maladies of all sorts, including cancer, heart disease, Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, spinal cord—the long litany of maladies which confront mankind.

The stem cell debate began with the hearings conducted by the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, which I chair and on which Senator TOM HARKIN is ranking member. We began those hearings within days of the November 1998 announcement and have had some 18 hearings on stem cells to explore all ramifications of the potential of stem cells.

There is now an avalanche of evidence that the use of stem cells in scientific research has boundless potential. The state of the law is that federal funding may only be used for a limited number of obsolete stem cell lines.

The bill which is the fundamental issue before the Senate today is H.R. 810, which Senator HARKIN and I introduced as a Senate bill with some 42 cosponsors, which would allow research on embryonic stem cells.

There are two other bills at issue. One is S. 2754 which Senator SANTORUM and I have introduced which relates to long-range research not involving the embryos, but it is totally separate and distinct from H.R. 810 in that it does not have the potential that the embryonic stem cells have and it is long range.

The third bill is S. 3504 which relates to fetus farming prohibition, and I believe there will be little controversy about this bill. The bill would deal with two unethical activities—the solicitation or acceptance of human fetal tissue knowing that a pregnancy was deliberately initiated to provide such tissue and the solicitation or acceptance of tissues or cells from a human embryo or fetus that was gestated in the uterus of a nonhuman animal. I believe there will be no contest about that.

I expect relatively little contest about S. 2754, which does not in any way relate to the importance of research on embryonic stem cells.

The embryonic stem cells are used from many embryos which have been created for in vitro fertilization. Customarily, a dozen or so are created, maybe three or four are used, and the others are then frozen and ultimately will be discarded. There are some 400,000 of those embryos which are frozen today, and the likelihood of their being used is nil.

Senator HARKIN and I introduced legislation to provide for Federal funding to encourage adoption of these embryos. If they could be used to create human life, I would not in the remotest way contend that they ought to be used for scientific research. But the fact is that they will either be used for scientific research or thrown away.

When the issue of adoption was raised, as I say, we took the lead in the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee in the year 2002 and appropriated $1 million and since then have appropriated more in succeeding years.

As of May 31, 2006, the Snow Flake Organization, one of the Department of Health and Human Services' embryonic adoption grantees, had a news conference announcing that there had been 100 births since 1997. As of May 31, 2006, the National Embryo Donation Center had a total of 28 deliveries or ongoing pregnancies. Out of the 400,000, even with Federal funding available to encourage adoption, the number is 128, which makes it conclusive that these 400,000 embryos will either be used for scientific research or thrown away.

The bill which Senator HARKIN and I have introduced is very carefully structured to be sure that it satisfies the strictest ethical scrutiny.

This is the essence of the bill: first, that the stem cells were originally created for fertility treatment purposes; second, are in excess of the clinical need; third, the individual seeking fertility treatments for whom the embryos were created has determined that the embryos will not be implanted in a woman; fourth, they will be otherwise discarded; and fifth, the individual for whom embryos were created has provided written consent for embryo adoption.

This bill does not allow Federal funds to be used for the derogation of stem cell lines, a step in the process where the embryo is destroyed—the lines are created and the embryos are destroyed before they are subjected to research which is funded by the Federal Government under the bill which Senator HARKIN and I are promoting.